

Michał NÉMETH

Jagiellonian University in Kraków & Johannes Gutenberg University of Mainz

IS HUNG. ÓCSÁROL 'TO SLANDER, TO DEFAME' NOT A TURKIC LOANWORD? A SLAVONIC COUNTERPROPOSITION

The article revisits the existing etymologies of Hung. *ócsárol* 'to slander, to defame' and offers a new solution, namely that the verb derives from Slav. *očariti* 'to enchant; to cast a spell on somebody'.

etymology, Hungarian etymology, Slavonic loanwords in Hungarian,
Turkic loanwords in Hungarian

1. The research project launched in spring 2011 by Károly Gerstner with the aim of creating a new etymological dictionary of Hungarian (ÚESz, see e.g. Gerstner 2014) won an ally in its efforts to investigate the oldest layer of Turkic lexicon in that language: The work of the late Árpád Berta and of András Róna-Tas (2011), abbreviated usually as TLH (as used in this paper) or WOT, recapitulates and reviews almost everything that has hitherto been said about Old Turkic loanwords in Hungarian and places a more than helpful tool in the hands of Gerstner and his colleagues. And even if we find any data, views or even methodological guidelines that might be debatable in TLH,¹ such an opus remains a desideratum with regard to Slavonic loanwords in Hungarian. The most recent comprehensive

1 Above all, see the opinions expressed by Csúcs (2012), Jankowski (2013), Stachowski (2014), and Honti (forthcoming). In their reviews, Uçar (2011), Agyagási (2012),

study in this field remains Kniezsa's work from 1955, and it is worth being aware of the fact that more than 60 years have passed since then. More importantly, his views were often adopted uncritically by the editors and authors of TESz, which was published in three volumes in the years 1967–1976 (see e.g. Zoltán 2011), and was echoed in EWUng (1993–1995).

These two fields of investigation have been juxtaposed here for a reason. Firstly, in both fields the approach to the question of what the exact donor languages are has been elaborated on extensively in the last two decades. In the case of Turcology, the reconstruction of the sound system and derivational morphology of those Turkic languages that Hungarian had contact with – and are referred to under the umbrella term West(ern) Old Turkic (WOT) – has improved considerably since Ligeti's last works (e.g. Ligeti 1976, 1986). The results of these endeavours are evident, above all, in Róna-Tas (1998) and TLH (1071–1176, written by András Róna-Tas after Árpád Berta's passing). Additionally, based on these studies, new conclusions have been drawn with regard to Ancient and Old Hungarian phonology. Slavacists, in turn, have addressed the issue of Pannonian Slavonic and the date of the break-up of Slavonic linguistic unity. It seems possible that the Magyar tribes arrived in the territories of Central-Eastern Europe at a time when the Slavs of Pannonia spoke a more or less uniform Slavonic divided into slightly different dialects. This stands in contrast to the traditional view, shared of course also by Kniezsa, that the separate Slavonic languages had already developed at that time (see Zoltán 2005a, 2013, 2014).² Finally, attempts have also been made to reconstruct the Pannonian Slavonic dialects used at the time the Magyars inhabited this area – based on Slavonic loanwords in Hungarian. These attempts (see e.g. Chelimskij 1988 or Richards 2003), were, however, far less elaborate than the conclusions made in TLH.

Ölmez (2012), Robbeets (2012), Bichlmeier (2013), and Hitch (2015) have merely presented the content of TLH and supplemented it with further data instead of critically evaluating it.

- 2 According to Zoltán, Pannonian Slavonic may have split into two main dialects at the time when the Hungarians invaded Pannonia: one reflecting Western and South-Western Slavonic features, while in the other South-Eastern Slavonic features predominated (see Zoltán 2013). Chelimskij's (1988) view was somewhat more radical: he considered Pannonian Slavonic to be rather uniform. Bearing these three different viewpoints in mind, in the present paper the abbreviation *Slav.* will be used in front of etymons to show that even though the Slavonic origin of a certain Hungarian word is beyond any doubt, the exact donor language or dialect remains unknown.

Secondly, we are often confronted in the etymological literature with the question of whether a certain Hungarian word is of Slavonic or Turkic origin³ – this issue is often also addressed against a background of previous attempts to explain the respective word as an example of Hungarian internal development. We can instance the discussion on the origin of Hung. *bér* ‘wage, rent’ (Kniezsa 1955: 796; TLH: 115–118), *darázs* ‘wasp’ (Berta 2001; Zoltán 2010, 2015; Németh 2011), *sebes* ‘fast, quick’ (TLH: 706–707; Zoltán 2012a, 2012b), *ocsúdik* ‘to come to, to awake’ (TLH: 1214–1217; Németh 2015), *tábor* ‘(military) camp’ (TLH: 837–841; Németh 2014) or *tör* ‘to break’ (Zoltán 2005b, 2006; TLH: 935–937). The present article is a continuation of this discussion: a Slavonic origin is proposed for the Hung. *ócsárol* ‘to slander, to defame’ – a word considered to be ultimately of Turkic origin.

2. Hung. *ócsárol* is explained as a derivative or possible derivative of *olcsó* ‘cheap’ (Simonyi 1880: 265; Balassa 1894: 279; Horger 1924: 131–132, s.v. *olcsó*; Fokos 1932: 112–114; SzófSz: 221; TESz 2: 1065; Nyirkos 1959: 489, 1987: 129; EWUng: 1053; ESz: 583; TLH: 635–636, s.v. *olcsó*; ÚESz). Hung. *olcsó*, in turn, was hitherto considered by most researchers to be a Turkic loanword (Vámbéry 1870: 166; Munkácsi 1928: 87; Fokos 1932: 112–114; TESz 2: 1074; EWUng: 1058; ESz: 586; Dybo 2010: 89–90; TLH: 635–636; ÚESz). Previously, it was also believed that *olcsó* evolved from *alsó* ‘the one under’ (Budenz 1871: 107; Horger 1924: 131–132; Gombocz 1907: 308–309, 1908: 71), but this idea was later refuted by Uralists for phonetic reasons (*olcsó* is missing in MSzFE).⁴ A third opinion was expressed by Nyirkos (1959: 488–489), namely that *olcsó* is a -csó diminutive derived from Hung. *ó* meaning ‘(very) old, ancient’. This idea has never been accepted by etymologists, yet neither has it been refuted: Nyirkos’s article is quoted only in TESz, but its content has been ignored in the entry. Perhaps this is so because this etymology has two very serious drawbacks: -csó is only used to form nouns and emerged not earlier than the Middle Hungarian period (but, in fact, it was productive mainly in the 19th–20th centuries; see MNyt: 613).

As we have already said, a number of authors agreed that *ócsárol* goes back to the Turkic-derived *olcsó*, but the degree of certainty with reference to this

3 This question concerns, first of all, the oldest layer of Turkic loanwords in Hungarian; we leave aside the question of the Ottoman Turkic loanwords transmitted by South-Slavonic languages.

4 In his work from 1941, Bárczi rejected neither of these two hypotheses (SzófSz: 223).

etymology varies in the above mentioned etymological dictionaries: the authors of TESz and EWUng as well as ESz say that *olcsó* is probably (or possibly) a Turkic loanword and the verb *ócsárol* is most likely a derivative of the latter. In TESz it is additionally asserted that *ócsárol* might originate from an unknown stem and it could have been mistakenly associated with *olcsó*. As far as the etymons are concerned, in TESz it is Tkc. **ušaγ* or Tkc. **alčay*, in Fokos (1932: 113) and EWUng it is Tkc. **ušaγ*, in Munkácsi (1928: 87) it is **alčag*, in Dybo (2010: 89) it is PT **al(č)ak* (an ultimate etymon), and in TLH it is WOT **učaγ* (for further information see the TLH-entry quoted below).⁵

3. To begin with, let me repeat the head of the relevant entry in TLH (626, 635–636)⁶ given that the etymology of *ócsárol* presented there is the most recent⁷ and most elaborated. I will attempt to propose an alternative to it.

ÓCSÁROL ‘to disparage’ see **OLCSÓ**

OLCSÓ [olčō] ‘cheap’ | 1528 *olčōnak* [olčō-nâk], 1557 *ocoban* [ōčō-ban] | *olčō* < *ōčō* [with unorg *l*] < **učaγ* < **učay* ← WOT **učay* < **učag* || **ÓCSÁROL** ‘to disparage’ | p1416/1466 meg *ollarlatot* [meg olčārl-âtott], c1456 *ocharuan* [ōčār-vān], 1566 *olczárllya* [olčārl-yā], *olcsárol* [olčārol], 1588 *ocharollyak* [ōčārol-yāk] | *ōčārol*- ~ *olčārol*- < *olčō* ~ *ōčō* {with suff +*ArOl*-} | EOT **učak* ‘what is light, cheap’ < *uč*- ‘to fly’ > *učuz* ‘cheap’.⁸

5 There was also an earlier attempt to derive Hung. *olcsó* and *ócsárol* eventually from Tkc. *učuz* ‘cheap’ or Tkc. *alčaq* ‘low; vile’ (see Vámbéry 1870: 166; Munkácsi 1928: 87), but these explanations do not hold water (see TLH: 637–638; see also Budenz 1871: 106–107; Gombocz 1907: 308–309, 1908: 71).

6 Árpád Berta was responsible for entries C–G and L–Z, while András Róna-Tas handled the remaining entries and chapters of the work.

7 We have not taken into consideration the preliminary draft of ÚESz made accessible to the public at nszt.nyttud.hu/etimologia.html.

8 At this point it must be stressed that the etymology of *olcsó* will not be discussed in the present article. This is mainly so because of the limitations of space which were also in force for the editors of this volume. Secondly, the question of whether it is valid to say that *ócsárol* is a derivative of *olcsó* can be analysed also without being sure whether *olcsó* is of Turkic or native or any other origin. The etymology of *olcsó* proposed in TLH seems the most convincing so far, even though, in my opinion, it has one important shortcoming, namely, the comparative data gathered to support the

From the phonetic transcription of the Hungarian forms above it transpires that spelling reflects the OHung. *ō* ~ *ol*- alternation in word-initial position, i.e. *olcsárol* ~ *ócsárol*. This, however, needs a word of explanation.

The word in question existed in several phonetic variants. Based on NySz (2: 1094, s.vv. *ócsál*, *męg-ócsál*, *ócsálás*, *ócsáltat*, *ócsárol*, *męg-ócsárol*, *ócsárlás*), TESz, RMG (536), and EWUng, we can prepare the following list of its earliest attestations in the Old and Middle Hungarian period. The linguistic data are listed in the original orthography (in chevrons) followed by their possible phonetic value as well as by the date and source of attestation.

A. Forms

1. <megoliázlatot⁹>, i.e. [megolčarlátott] or [megölčarlátott] – a. 1416/1466 (MünchK)
2. <ocharuan>, i.e. [očārvān] or [ōčārvān] – ca. 1456 (SermDom)
3. <olcharl̥ya>, i.e. [olčārlja] or [ōlčārlja] – ca. 1456 (SermDom)
4. <ólczárll̥ya>, i.e. [ōlčārljā] – 1566 (Heltai)
5. <ochyarollyak>, i.e. [očāroljāk] or [ōčāroljāk] – 1588 (Frankovith)
6. <oczállom>, i.e. [očállom] – 1611 (Szenczi)
7. <oltfallya>, i.e. [olčāl̥jā] – 1650 (Medgyesi)
8. <ochálsz>, i.e. [očāls] or [ōčāls] – 1650/1651 (Zrínyi)
9. <ótsállom>, <ótsárlom>, <ótsárolom>, i.e. [ōčállom], [ōčārlom], [ōčārolom] – 1708 (Pápai Páriz)

existence of the asterisked WOT **učay* < **učag* < **uč-* ‘to fly’ + *-ag* (deverbal nominal derivative suffix) has, in fact, nothing in common with WOT **učay*: the referential material consists of more than 80 *učuz* ~ *užuz*-type forms. The authors of the entry admit that “*učuz* presents an exact semantic parallel of H[ung.] *olcsó*, but with another morphology” (TLH 2: 637), but it has been left unsaid that these forms, in fact, contradict such an etymology: all over the Turkic linguistic world the *učuz* ~ *užuz*-type derivatives of the verb *uč-* were and still are used to express ‘cheap’ (see also ĚSTJa 1: 567–568; the word is richly documented), whereas there is no trace of an *-ag*-derivative in this meaning. For this reason, the reconstructed WOT **učay* must remain merely a hypothetical reconstruction without any kind of relevant philological supportive evidence.

- 9 The letter *l* undoubtedly stands for *č* (even if its origin has not yet been satisfactorily explained), *z* stands for *r* (cf. its variant in the so called *lettre bâtarde*).

B. Commentary to A

1. OHung. *megolcsárlatott*¹⁰ or *mególcsárlatott* is a passive 3rd pers. sg. form preceded by the *meg-* verbal prefix built from *olcsárol* or *ólcsárol*. TLH mentions [megolčārlātott] as the only possible reading (with a short *o-*), even though in the Codex of Munich no distinction was made between vowel length quantity (see Nyíri 1971: 33) and the word might as well be deciphered as [megōlčārlātott]; for a reliable example of *ōlč-* cf. 4.
2. OHung. *ócsárván* or *ocsárván* is a *-ván* verbal adverb recorded in the Codex of Budapest (*Budapesti Glosszák* or *Budapesti kódex*) of the so called *Sermones Dominicales*. There is no consistent distinction between *o* and *ō* in *SermDom* (see Kniezsa 1952: 97), either, therefore the word-initial letter might stand for either sound. What is puzzling and conspicuous here is that its verbal base is *ócsár* or *ocsár*, which is the only known example of such a form. See Szilády's edition (1910 1: 20; quoted after RMG), which, however, received harsh criticism from linguists, above all Zolnai (1910: 460–474, 1911: 181–182) and Mészöly (1910). See also 3. For a reliable example of *oč-* cf. 6.
3. OHung. *olcsárlja* or *ólcsárlja* is a 3rd pers. sg. present tense form (definite conjugation), the verbal base of which is *olcsárl* or *ólcsárl*. It is recorded in *SermDom*, too (see 2), i.e. the initial <o> might stand for both *o* and *ō*. We find it in RMG, but not in TESz, EWUng or TLH.

Less importantly, the actual phonetic value of <lj> might have been [Í].

4. MHung. *ólcsárlja* is transcribed as [olčārljā] in TLH, again, with a short *o-* even though it is written with <ó-> [ō-] in the original source (Heltai 1566). In EWUng, as an explanation of the original <ólczárlyja>, the editors decided to repeat what we see in NySz (2: 1094, s.v. *ócsárol*) and TESz (after NySz), namely: “ólcsárol”. The latter form is, however, a transcription in modern Hungarian orthography made by the authors of NySz in 1891, a fact which is indicated in both TESz and EWUng (see “ólcsárol [Umschrift]” in EWUng). This form has been taken over by the compilers of TLH in a way that suggests that it was written thus in 1588. Additionally, it has been altered in TLH into *olcsárol*, probably in order to tally with the *ō-* ~ *ol-* pattern.

The actual phonetic value of <lly> might also have been [Í] or [ÍÍ]. However, this, again, is of lesser importance.

10 Henceforth, for greater clarity and conformity with Modern Hungarian data, all Hungarian forms will be quoted in modern Hungarian orthography – unless the exact reading of a form would be ambiguous to the reader.

5. MHung. *ocsárolják* or *ócsárolják* is a 3rd pers. pl. present tense form of the definite conjugation. In TLH it is transcribed as [ōčāroljāk]. The initial sound, however, might as well be an *o* or *ō*; Frankovith (1588) did not distinguish between a long and short *o* in any position (see examples in Borsa 1956), either. For a reliable example of *oč-* cf. 6.

Again, the actual phonetic value of <lly> might also have been [ÍÍ] (lengthened in intervocalic position).

6. MHung. *ocsállom*, a present tense 1st pers. sg. form of the definite conjugation. The verbal base is *ocsáll-*. We find it in Albert Szenczi Molnár’s dictionary (1611), in which a long *ō* and a short *o* were clearly distinguished, cf. the facsimile of the dictionary’s first edition from 1604 (available on-line), where <O’> and <O> are used for *ō-* and *o-*, respectively.
7. MHung. *olcsálja* is a 3rd pers. sg. present tense form (definite conjugation), see Medgyesi (1650: 47). In this work there is a clear distinction between short *o* and long *ō*.
8. MHung. *ocsálsz* or *ócsálsz* is a 2nd pers. sg. form of the indefinite conjugation. It appears in Zrínyi’s *Adriai Tengernek Syrenaiá*. I have only been able to check this form in a manuscript stored in Zagreb (and not in the Viennese print from 1651), in which *o* and *ō* are not distinguished (see folio 161 v^o; the facsimile is available on-line).
9. MHung. *ócsállom*, *ócsárlom* and *ócsárolom* are present tense 1st pers. sg. forms of the definite conjugation. They are attested in Ferenc Pápai Páriz’s (1708) dictionary in which the distinction between *o* and *ō* is clear. The *ócsárolom* ~ *ócsárlom* alternation is regular and raises no doubts (cf. the so called Horger’s law, see Horger 1911).

It is paramount that we are aware of the fact that the syncopation of the syllable closing *-l* along with the simultaneous lengthening of the vowel preceding it is a well-known and widespread process in Hungarian.¹¹ Moreover, the appearance of an inorganic *l* after a long vowel with simultaneous shortening of that originally

11 The origin of this process lies in the tendency towards vocalization of *l* in front of dental plosives and affricates that begin as a dental stop and release as a fricative (i.e. among others in front of *č*). This took place roughly in the 12th–14th centuries. The diphthongs that emerged in this process evolved into long vowels (*volt* > (~) *vout* > (~) *vót*). Later on, by way of analogy, this phenomenon developed into a widely used {long vowel} : {short vowel + *l*} alternation operating regardless of the phonetic environment (see Benkő 1957: 78–79) and also involved words with inorganic *-l-* (see below).

long vowel is also common (in Hungarian this process is called *téves visszaütés eredményeként keletkezett l* and consists, generally speaking, in hypercorrection, see e.g. Nyirkos 1987: 126–131). Still, the reader of the entry in TLH might have the impression that the Old and Middle Hungarian linguistic data were intentionally presented in a way that tallies with the \bar{o} - ~ *ol*- pattern and, eventually, to bring *ócsárol* closer to Hung. *olcsó* ~ Hung. dial. *ócsó* ~ *ócsú*. (ÚMTSz). Such a description strongly suggests that there is little possibility that these two words are not related etymologically to each other.

At the same time, the *olč-* ~ *ōlč-* ~ *oč-* ~ *ōč-* alternation present in the Old and Middle Hungarian data cannot, by any means, serve as an argument against the theory that *ócsárol* derives from Hung *olcsó*. In fact, we can find some reliable examples from which it transpires that the same alternation may have appeared in both *olcsó* and *ócsárol*, see e.g. *olcsó* with word-initial *ōl-* in NySz or Nyirkos (1959: 489).¹² The alternation mentioned here is merely an argument against the explanation presented in TLH, i.e. the \bar{o} - in *ócsárol* may be treated exclusively as a result of compensatory lengthening following the loss of the internal inorganic *l* of its alleged nominal base *olcsó*. Apparently, in the Old and Middle Hungarian forms inorganic *-l* may have appeared independently, in words beginning both with *o-* or \bar{o} -, or, also, as a result of *ócsárol* being contaminated with *olcsó* (below, we will attempt to prove that the latter could have easily taken place). All in all, the alternation in question should be used as an argument in favour of treating *-l* as an inorganic sound, only.

C. Meanings and the context of use

Firstly, it is certainly worth mentioning that the word's earliest known attestation, i.e. <megollazlatot>, is to be found in a translation of Luke (16:1),¹³ given that its use in the Bible makes establishing its exact meaning quite straightforward.

12 The transcription of the earliest forms listed in TLH (after TESz and EWUng) is not precise enough in this respect, either: <olLonak> comes from the so-called Codex of Székelyudvarhely (1526–1528; SzékK) (see N. Abaffy 1993: 316 [facsimile], 317 [transcription]; in TLH quoted as: <olčonak>, i.e. the transcription used by Szabó 1908: 35 and repeated later in TESz and EWUng has been taken over), whereas <ocoban> appears in a private letter written in October 1557 (see Szalay 1861: 262) – in both sources *o* and \bar{o} were not distinguished, hence both readings are valid.

13 In a copy from 1466 of the Codex of Munich written originally after 1416.

The verse goes as follows (see Döbrentei, Jászay 1842: 166–167; Nyíri 1971: 300; Szabó 1985: 232):

Monduala ke-¹⁴ ɔ taneituaninac. Vala eg neminèmɔ kaʒdag èmber kin^c vala fol-naga s èʒ megolazlatot ɔ nala monnal èltekoʒlottaolna ɔ iauit.

Its Latin equivalent is (after Nyíri 1971: 300):

Dicebat autem et ad discipulos suos: Homo quidam erat dives, qui habebat vilicum, et hic diffamatus est apud illum quasi dissipasset bona ipsius.¹⁵

Ergo, in this sentence the analysed verb was used in the meaning of ‘to defame, to defame by accusation’.

In Modern Hungarian, the verb means ‘to slander, to defame’ and, in fact, it is with these two meanings that the word was used throughout the Old, Middle and Modern Hungarian period, i.e. with the meaning of ‘to accuse, defame by accusation’ and ‘to slander, to defame’ (see also TESz and EWUng as well as SzT 9: 903 for an overview of the word’s semantics). I was unable to access the full text of SermDom and Frankovith (1588) to check the context the word was used in there. However, in the works of Heltai, Medgyesi and in the poem of Zrinyi, the context clearly shows that the word meant ‘to defame, to slander, to shame’, see (cited in a modernized orthography):

- a. Heltai (1566; see the 50th fable¹⁶):

[...] *akit a fejedelem kedvel, azt igen dicsíri, magasztalja; akit kedig nem kedvel a fejedelem, azt ócsárlja, szidja* [...].

[...] the one who is cherished by the monarch, he is praised by him and eulogized; but the one who is not cherished by the monarch, he is slandered, scolded by him [...].

14 An abbreviation of OHung. *kedig* ‘but; also; on the other hand’ (see EWUng: 718).

15 Let me quote Luke (16:1) as translated in the King James Bible: *And he said also unto his disciples, There was a certain rich man, which had a steward; and the same was accused unto him that he had wasted his goods.*

16 The fable is entitled (in a modernized orthography): *A majmokról és két emberről, egyik igazmondóról, másik hízeltködéről* ‘About monkeys and two people, one a truth teller, the other a flatterer’.

b. Medgyesi (1650: 47):

Az embertelen motskolódásával-is igen meszsze nem mehet. Inkább az ő Feje tők, hogy az Presbytereknek műhelyekből-való felmenéseket oltsálja, holot Pál Apostol sőt Chistus Urunk-is műhelyből mentenek az Eggyházi προσασίαια [...].

One cannot go far with inhumane abuse. It is rather he whose head is a pumpkin [i.e. who is a nitwit], when he defames the processions of the Presbyters starting from their places of work, although also Paul the Apostle, nay, our Lord Christ went from their places of work for ecclesiastic processions [...].

c. Zrínyi (1650–1651: 161 v^o)

Viola / Ugy van igen szeretem mit akarsz tehát / Szeretem Licaont s az ő musikäiát. Titirus: Kegyetlen mit mondasz / Engem versz beszéddel / Szépet ruttá csinálsz / Rutat irsz föstékkel / Engem azért ocsálsz / Hogy esmérjem evel / Menivel oroszláni haragosa báránynál, / Annira kegyetleneb te oroszlánynál.

Viola: / That is thus, yes, I love him, so what do you want? / I love Licaon and his music. / Titirus: / You, cruel, what do you say? / You strike me with words, / turn beautiful into ugly, / paint ugliness with paint. / You slander me to / make me recognize: / As much as more furious is a lion than a lamb / so much crueller are you than a lion.

The other sources mentioned above are dictionaries, in which the word is presented without a context – see, however, the following commentary:

Curious as it may seem, *ócsárol* also acquired the meaning ‘to consider cheap’, but this took place much later, namely in the 18th century (from around 1750 on¹⁷). The reliability of this semantic data is, however, questionable. Its late appearance was already conspicuous in the eyes of the authors of TESz and they admitted that the late and rare use of this meaning should perhaps be explained by its mistaken association with *olcsó*. In this context, the authors of TESz do not reject the idea that *ócsárol* might originate from another stem of unknown origin (i.e. not from *olcsó*).

As a matter of fact, if we take a look at Late Old Hungarian dictionaries, we can find some circumstantial evidence indicating that *ocsárol* was influenced by *olcsó*. For example, if we compare the respective entries of Ferenc Pápai Páriz’s

17 As asserted by TESz and EWUng, the data in question appears in the so-called Heptalogus (see TESz.), i.e. in *Heptalogus, az az: Görög Orfági hét Böltsék jó erköltsre oktató mondási. és Cato közönséges erköltsre tanító bölts parantsolati [...]* published in Buda in 1750. I had, however, no access to this source.

(1649–1716) dictionary (1708) with the dictionary of Péter Bod (1712–1769) published in 1767 and constituting an extended edition of the former (cf. for instance, the title of the latter work; both dictionaries play an extremely important role in the history of Hungarian), we see the following (the pairs of entries quoted, in both dictionaries, are next to each other):

- d. Pápai Páriz Ferenc (1708: 179):

Ótsállom : *Vilito, Vilipendo, Derogo, Contemno, is. Vitupero, as.*
Ótsárlom, ótsárolom : *Idem*

It is important to note that there is no *olcsó* in this dictionary.

- e. Bod Péter (1767: 271, 274):

Oltsárlom : *Depretio. ich mindere den Werth.*
Oltsó : *Vitis pretii. wohlfeil.*

Ótsállom : *Vilito, Vilipendo, Derogo, Contemno, is. Vitupero, as. ich mach ge-
ringschätzig, schände.*

Ótsárlom, Ótsárolom : *Idem*

When seen in this light, it seems quite telling that <oltsárlom> was added to Bod's dictionary with the following definition: 'to lower the value' together with the entry <oltsó> 'cheap' (and with the additional meanings provided in German).¹⁸ Moreover, this dictionary makes a clear semantic distinction between *olcsárol* and *ócsárol*.

In fact, it would be rather striking if the verb meaning 'to accuse' had first developed from a word meaning 'cheap' and then, more than three centuries later, the sense 'to accuse' had broadened to include the additional meaning 'to lower the value' – without using the adjective *olcsó* 'cheap' for this purpose, as is the case in Hung. (rare) *olcsóll* ~ *olcsól* 'to consider cheap' (CzF 4: 1028).¹⁹ The late appearance of the latter meaning and the high probability that *olcsó* phonetically influenced *ócsárol* forces us to put aside this semantic data (first appearing ca. 1750) when discussing whether *ócsárol* is a derivative of *olcsó*. For the same reason, probably, the authors of TLH did not even mention this 18th-c. semantic change.

18 For a critique of Péter Bod's command of German, see Simonyi (1890: 279–280).

19 See our reasoning below concerning the question why *olcsól*, *olcsóll* cannot be treated as variants of arch. *olcsál* and *olcsáll*.

D. Morphology

As a next step, let us present the existing Old and Middle Hungarian variants once again – in an order reflecting their structure and degree of complexity:

Without *-l-*:

- *ócsár* or *ocsár* (1456, only)
- *ocsál* or *ócsál* (1650)
- *ocsáll* (1611)
- *ocsárol* or *ócsárol* (1588)

With *-l-*:

- *olcsál* (1650)
- *olcsárl* or *ólcsárl* (1456)
- *olcsárol* or *ólcsárol* (a. 1416/1466)

Some of the forms contain an *l* in the first syllable, which, as we argued above, is most probably unetymological (and also not morphological) in character. No better explanation has been proposed for it so far and, in fact, we cannot find any other explanation for it, either.²⁰ Its unetymological nature seems all the more probable as there is a vast number of examples of such a phenomenon in Hungarian (see e.g. Nyirkos 1987: 125–132, 135 and Tóth 2004: 454–461 for dozens of examples). A good parallel is Hung. *Olnod* (a place name, see e.g. Hoffmann 2005: 207) first attested in 1296 < Slav. *Vnud* (see Fehértói 1983: 362).²¹ Besides, the unetymological *-l-* may also have appeared as a result of contamination with *olcsó*.

Now, we ought to explicate the relationship between the forms ending in *-ál*, *-áll*, *-ár*, and *-ár(o)l*.

20 There was only one etymology that treated this *-l-* as belonging to the root – the one that linked *olcsó* with the Hungarian reflex of Ural. **ala* ‘the place under’, cf. e.g. the Hungarian postposition *alatt* ‘under’ or *alsó* ‘the one under’ (see e.g. EWUng 19–20, s.v. *al*). However, as we mentioned above, this idea was challenged by Uralists and Turkologists.

21 Contrary to what may seem apparent, Hung. *Ócsár* (a place name; Hoffmann 2005: 205) attested since 1247/1412 as <Olchar> (see Tóth 2004: 455; Hoffmann 2005: 205) is not a perfect parallel here: it derives from the Slav. *Ovčary* (a place name), which means that originally, due to Slav. *ov-* > Hung. *oβ-* > *ó-* change (the vocalisation of *β* could have taken place in syllable-closing positions), there was a long word-initial vowel in this toponym in Hungarian and the medial *-l-* appeared as a result of hypercorrection.

TESz treats *ócsárol* and *ócsál* as *-r + l* and *-l* derivatives of *olcsó*, respectively. The same opinion, although in somewhat abridged form and in an obscure manner, has been reproduced in EWUng, cf.: „End: VBSf *-árol*. End *ál* der Var *ócsál* entsand durch Assim.” (we will comment on this “EWUng-Deutsch” passage in a footnote below). The authors of ESz and TLH also assert that *ócsárol* is an *-árol* derivative, but they do not explain all the other variants. The question of the relationship between the *ócsárol*- and *ócsál*-type forms is explained in both TESz and EWUng by redirecting the reader to the following words (these examples will play an important role in our discussion):

- *becsmérel* (1746) ~ *becsméll* (1650) ~ *becsmél* (1788) ‘to disparage, to defame’ (TESz 1: 265–266; EWUng 89–90), explained as *-érel* ~ *-él* iterative forms built from *becs* ‘value; worth’ supplemented with the *-m* inchoative verb suffix (cf. *eszmél* ‘1. to reckon; 2. to regain consciousness’ and *kegymél* ‘to pamper, to take care carefully’; see our remark at the end of the present paper), with the annotation that it is not possible to establish the relative chronology of appearance of these two forms; in this matter, the reader is redirected, again, to *pazal* [sic; should be: *pazall*] ~ *pazarol* ‘to waste’, *ócsál* ~ *ócsárol* and *sikál* ~ *sikárol* ‘to scrub, to rub, to clean’;

and

- *sikál* (1664) ~ *sikárol* (1493) ‘to scrub; to clean’ (TESz 2: 533; EWUng 1325–1326), explained as *-l* and *-r* derivatives built from *sík* (the etymology in TESz, EWUng, and TLH 2: 725–726 has some uncertain points) or *sikár* (in EWUng). The relationship regarding *sikál* and *sikárol* is explained by redirecting the reader, yet again, to *abárol* ~ *abál* ‘to blanch, to boil’ and *pazarol* ~ *pazall*.

Thus, to understand what the authors and editors of TESz and EWUng meant we must take a look at two other entries:

- *pazarol* (1598) ~ *pazall* (17th c.) ‘to waste’ (TESz 3: 138–139; EWUng 1134), explained as a probable loanword from SSLav. („Serbo-Croatian”) *pazariti* ‘to trade, to merchandise; to buy’, without an opinion on the relationship between *pazall* and *pazarol* expressed;

and

- *abál* (around 1580) ~ *abárol* (1561) ‘to blanch, to boil’ (TESz 1: 89; EWUng 2), originated from Slav. *obariti* < *obvariti* id.; with the relation of *abál* and *abárol* explained by the following chain of changes: *abárol* > *abárl* > *abáll* > *abál*.

If we want to find an exact parallel to the *ócsárol* ~ *ócsáll* ~ *ócsál* &c. alternation, we have extremely modest material at our disposal and it is difficult to find an example that would be completely reliable. Examples with a similar morphological alternation mentioned above are either loanwords in which *-r* belongs to the base (*abárol*, *pazarol*) rather than being a suffix, or words of unclear morphological structure and origin (*becsmérel*²², *sikárol*²³), or words attested in relatively recent sources (*becsmérel*). Also belonging to the latter group is Hung. *fecsérel* (1640) ~ *fecsél* (1763) ‘to waste, to squander’ (TESz 1: 856; Simonyi 1880: 265), which is considered to be a derivative of a passive stem of onomatopoeic origin.

Nevertheless, the example of *abárol* > *abárl* > *abáll* > *abál* is especially valuable, since we can be sure that the *-r* in it is not a suffix, but rather part of the root, i.e. that it is *-ll* (> *-l*) that evolved from *-rl* and not the other way round.²⁴

22 According to TLH (107–109, s.v. *becsül*), the word *becs* is a result of back-formation from *becsül* ‘to estimate; to esteem, to appreciate’ which is of debatable Turkic origin (< WOT **bičil* ‘to be cut; to be in agreement, to be ordered in agreement’).

23 As far as the latter word is concerned, TLH (725–726) suggests “separating Hung. *sík* ‘flat’ from **sik* in *síkos* ‘slippery’ and *siklik* ‘to glide, to slide’”; i.e. TLH suggests separating *sikál* ~ *sikárol* from their etymon alleged in TESz.

24 The *-rl* > *-ll* assimilation is probably what the authors of EWUng had meant in the obscure quotation above. This direction of change seems to be supported by the adduced referential material, too. Namely, if we take a look at the linguistic data, we see that forms with *ll* tend to appear relatively late – not earlier than the beginning of the 17th c.: <betseméllik> (1650) vs. <bötsmélélése> (1764), <fetsélleniek> (1763) vs. <fetsérlést> (1640), <oczállom> (1611) vs. <megollazlatot> (after 1416/1466), <pazolljatok> (17th c.) vs. <pázárlot> (1598), <sikáló> (1664) and <sikállott> (1679) vs. <Sykarlo> (1493) and <fykarlany> (1519) (yearly dates taken from TESz).

Moreover, it is difficult to defend the opposite opinion (i.e. *ll* > *rl*), namely that held by Simonyi (1880: 265), Kúnos (1882: 492), Horger (1924: 131–132) and Szily (1902: 179). Simonyi and Kúnos reconstructed an **ócsárol* to prove that there was a dissimilation taking place in *ócsárol*, Horger assumed an evolution along the lines of *olcsó* → *olcsáll* > *ócsáll* > (due to dissimilation) *ócsárl* > *ócsárol*, whereas Szily (1902: 179) claimed that there is no other way than to accept the *ócsállani* > *ócsárlani*, *ócsóllani* > *ócsórlani* change if one is to explain the existing phonetic variants. However, neither the chronology presented above nor the linguistic data support these assertions. Firstly, there is no form like **ócsárol*, even though the list of the existing phonetic variants of *ócsárol* is indeed impressive (see some additional forms presented below). Secondly, we would expect *olcsóll* rather than *olcsáll*, if the verbal base were *olcsó* and the derivative suffix used in this case were – as Horger and

Now, let us also take a look at the *-árol ~ -érel* suffix mentioned in the entries of TESz, EWUng, ESz, and TLH. It is interpreted as a compound suffix consisting of *r + l* that builds iterative forms. However, this suffix is not listed in the Hungarian historical and descriptive grammars or even articles devoted to the iterative verbs: whether in Old, Middle or Modern Hungarian (see e.g. Benkő 1984: 197; TNyt 1: 60–77, 2/1: 55–69 [written by Katalin Bartha]; Fabó 1989; Keszler 2000: 314–315; MNyt 357–362; ESz; &c.). Obviously, neither the small number of words ending in *-árol ~ -érel* (i.e. those mentioned above) nor the unproductivity of the suffix (*-r* became unproductive early in the Proto-Hungarian period, see TNyt. 1: 61–62) is not an argument in favour of omitting it from comprehensive grammatical descriptions of this kind.²⁵

In fact, if we take a closer look at the material, there are only two words that end in *-árol ~ -érel* and until now it has never been doubted that *r* does not belong to their stems: it is *becsmérel* ‘to disparage, to defame’ (attested since 1764!) and the already discussed *ócsárol* – interestingly, both meaning pretty much the same (!). *Abárol* and *pazarol* are Slavonic loanwords. Hung. *sikárol* ‘to scrub; to clean’ is rather considered a derivative of Hung. arch. *sikár* ‘bot. horsetail’ (horsetail was used for polishing metal vessels or weapons) (see EWUng 1326, s.v. *sikár*) whereas *fecsérel* ‘to waste’ is not clear morphologically (see TESz 1: 856 and EWUng 363, where it is not even analysed in detail; cf. also Balázs’s 1977: 274 critical remark regarding the etymology of *fecsérel* presented in TESz). This kind of morphological isolation would seem to be a conspicuous shortcoming if we were to explain the etymology of the word within Hungarian itself.²⁶

Szily claimed – the well-known *-ll* (cf. *kevés* ‘a few, a little’ → *kevesell* ‘to consider something too little; to find insufficient’, *sok* ‘many’ → *sokall* ‘to consider something too many’), cf. Hung. *olcsóll ~ olcsól* ‘to consider cheap’ mentioned above (Czf 4: 1028). In addition, if we assume that the double *-ll* in *ócsáll* is not the *-ll* suffix known from words like *kevesell* or *sokall*, but is rather the iterative *-l* suffix reinforced by repetition (i.e. it is a compound suffix that contains the same element used twice: *-l + -l*), then the question remains why the expected *-lal ~ -lel* (< *-l + -l*, see e.g. TNyt 1: 67) is not used in these forms.

25 In TNyt, i.e. in the most comprehensive study on Hungarian historical grammar, we can easily find *hapax legomena* discussed, like e.g. the OHung. *-tuz* compound suffix (TNyt 1: 65–66).

26 But there is another difficulty we must also face. We need to explain the *ó ~ á* variation if we are to link *ócsárol* with *olcsó*. The explanation should be sought in morphology since a purely phonetic *ó > á* change is highly improbable. We should rather expect

3. The example of Hung. *abárol* < Slav. *obariti* < *obvariti* (see ÈSSJa 30: 265–266) shows that the morphological difficulties we have with *ócsárol* might result from the fact that, instead of being a suffix, the *-r-* in this form belongs to a borrowed verbal stem. A good candidate for such an etymon is PSlav. **očariti*, **očarovati* ~ **občariti*, **občarovati* ← PSlav. **ob-* preposition + **čariti* ~ **čarovati* ‘to cast a spell on somebody; to enchant’ (see SlPsł. 2: 113; ÈSSJa 4: 23–25, 26: 133)²⁷ or some of its Slavonic reflexes (the word is present and well-documented in almost every Slavonic language, see the two dictionaries of Proto-Slavonic quoted above), cf. e.g. OPol. *oczarować* (15th/16th cc.) ‘to cast a spell on somebody’ (SStp 5: 407), ORuss. *občarovati* (17th c.) ~ *očarovati* (11th c.) ‘to cast a spell on somebody; to bewitch, to enchant’ (SRJaXI–XVII 12: 189, 14: 94), cf. also OCS очаровати ‘to witch’ (ÈSSJa 26: 133).

Phonetically, it is only the word-initial *ó* that requires explanation. The continuation of Slav. *o-* in Hungarian is usually *a* [á], cf. e.g. Hung. *acél* ‘steel’ < Slav. *ocělb* id. (ÈSSJa 32: 10; TESz 1: 93; EWUng 4). However, we can also find examples of *o-* in this position, e.g. Hung. *olaj* ‘oil’ < Slav. *olějb* id. (TESz 2: 1073; EWUng 1058), cf. OCS оѡѡ id. (SslS 411) or *ocsúdik* ‘to awake, to come to’ < ESLav. **očuditi sja*

ócsárol or *ócsál* to be derivatives of a nominal **ócsa* or even **ócsár*, but there is no evidence that would allow us to reconstruct such forms. It was Horger (1924: 132) who first realized that this needs some kind of commentary, and adduced word pairs like *bíró* ‘judge’ vs. *bírák* ‘judges’, *apró* ‘tiny, little’ vs. *apránként* ‘little by little’, *méltó* ‘worthy of’ vs. *méltán* ‘worthily, rightly’ (see also Horger 1924: 85–86, s.v. *idétlen*) to show that this variation is regular. His argumentation was repeated by Nyirkos (1959: 489), but otherwise, as far as I know, this issue has not been even touched upon by other authors and has been left undiscussed (see e.g. the entries in SzófSz, TESz, EWUng and ESz). Parallel examples would be convincing in this case if there were any other *-árol* ~ *-érel* derivative verbs that would exhibit an *á* or *é* in place of *ó* or *ő*. We can cite here *bíró* ‘judge’ → *bírál* (1621) ‘to criticize, to judge’ or *forró* (1181) ‘hot, scalding’ → *forráz* (1590) ‘to scald’ (TESz 1: 305, s.v. *bíró*; 955), but there is only a small number of such verbal forms. Finally, we ought to mention in passing that the *á* in *bírák* ‘judges’ (first attested in 1404) is irregular and unexpected (see e.g. TLH: 132). Hence it is quite risky to quote it as a parallel. As far as the other examples are concerned, in the word *apránként* *-á-* has been present since 1784 (ergo, it is quite recent data; this word has been used in the form *aprónként* since 1557, see TESz 1: 167), *méltán* is a fossilized adverbial form (TESz 2: 884), whereas *méltányol* ‘to respect, to appreciate’ is a recent derivative (first attested in 1820).

27 Hung. *ócsárol* cannot have originated from PSlav. **ob-* preposition + **čariti*, for Slav. *ob-* would most probably yield *ab-* [áb-] in Hungarian, cf. the example of *abál* ~ *abárol*.

‘1. to come to, to regain consciousness; 2. to wake up’ (Németh 2015: 37–38). The latter parallel is even more relevant as the *o-* in the Slavonic etymon is also a preposition (ESlav. **očuditi* originates from PSlav. prep. **ot* + **jutiti* ‘to feel, to sense, to perceive’).

As we have already mentioned, the lengthening of the *o-* can be easily explained by the appearance and loss of the inorganic *l* (cf. e.g. Benkő 1957: 78–79, 95; Nyirkos 1987: 126–131). The appearance of *-l-*, in turn, could have taken place independently in both *olcsó* and *olcsárol*, or is, perhaps, a result of contamination between these two words, as was the case most probably in Péter Bod’s dictionary form 1767 (see above). The latter phenomenon was also taken into consideration by the authors of TESz. Finally, it is worth mentioning that the preservation of the *ó-* could have been facilitated by the stressed position.

Morphologically, such an etymology raises no doubts. We know that in the vast majority of cases Slavonic borrowings that entered Hungarian received the *-l* and *-z* derivative suffixes (termed as *honosító képzők*, i.e. “nativizing suffixes”), see e.g. TNYt (2/1: 49), TLH (2: 1139–1140). Slavonic endings such as *-iti*, *-iti sja* or *-ovati* were disjoined and replaced with the Hung. *-l* (i.e. the absolute word stems were correctly identified). The case was different with early loan verbs taken from Turkic and, contrary to the prevailing opinion also expressed in TLH (2: 1139), in all probability also from Slavonic dialects, which had entered Hungarian without any additional morphemes (see Róna-Tas 2010: 40–41; Zoltán 2014: 212; Németh 2015: 37–38), like e.g. WOT **dül-* > Hung. *dől* ‘to lean, to topple over’ (TLH 2: 1140) or ESlav. **styditi* ‘to defame, to shame’ > Hung. *szid* (around 1315) ‘to reprimand’, see Zoltán (2014: 212). The latter example is also quoted to show a semantic parallel with the alleged Slavonic origin of Hung. *ócsárol*.

Other examples of Slavonic loanwords adopted by Hungarian without any derivative suffixes include Slav. **měriti* ‘to measure’ > Hung. (after 1372 / around 1448) *mér* id. (Zoltán 1999), the above mentioned *ocsúdik* ‘to awake, to come to, to regain consciousness’ (*-ik* is a marker of the mediopassive voice) < ESlav. **očuditi sja* ‘1. to come to, to regain consciousness; 2. to wake up’ (cf. Russ. *очудитися ~ очутиться* ‘1. to come to, to regain consciousness; 2. to wake up; 3. to get somewhere’) (Németh 2015) and (most probably also) Hung. *öblít* ‘to rinse’ < Slav. **obliti* ‘to pour something over’ (Zoltán 2005c). In the light of these three forms, i.e. *mér*, *ocsúdik*, and *szid*, it is perhaps legitimate to speculate whether *ócsárván*, attested ca. 1456, a *-ván* verbal adverb of the stem *ócsár* (or *ocsár*), indicates that *ócsárol* might have originally been borrowed from a Slavonic dialect without the usual *-l* suffix, too.²⁸ But we must bear in mind that Hung. *ócsár* is a *hapax legomenon*.

The semantic shift from ‘to cast a spell’ to ‘to defame’ requires more attention, but there are a number of parallels that make such a change plausible, cf. such reflexes of PSlav. **klęti* ‘put a spell on somebody or something’ as e.g. OPol. *kląć* ‘1. to put a curse on somebody; to excommunicate; 2. to curse, to wish bad things on somebody’ (SStp. 3: 282–283), OPol. *przekląć* ‘to wish ill; to condemn, to insult; to make somebody an outlaw’ (SStp. 7: 135), ORuss. *проклинати* ‘to put a curse on somebody; to excommunicate’ (SRJaXI–XVII 20: 151–152), *прокляти* id. (SRJaXI–XVII 20: 152); for further Slavonic examples see ÈSSJa (10: 37–39) (the word is very richly documented). On the Hungarian side, good examples of parallels include Hung. *átkoz* (around 1350) ‘1. to imprecate a curse on somebody; 2. to fulminate; 3. to excommunicate; to damn’ (TESz 1: 194) and Hung. *káromol* (after 1372 / around 1448) ‘1. to blaspheme; 2. (?) to ridicule; 2. to accuse; to slander’. But, cf. also Eng. *curse* ‘1. to swear; 2. to say rude things to somebody; 3. to use a magic word or phrase against somebody in order to harm them’.

Finally, for semantic reasons, it is very possible that Hung. *becsmérel* (1746) ‘to disparage, to defame’ and also *becsméll* (1650) ~ *becsmél* (1788) id. evolved due to contamination with *ócsárol* ~ *ócsáll* ~ *ócsál* and Hung. dial. *ocsmál* ~ *ócsmál* ~ *ocsmárol* ‘to disparage, to defame’ (Simonyi 1909: 471; MTsz 2:2; Nyirkos 1959: 489). The *-m-* in the latter three verbs, as well as *ocsmár* ‘hideous’ (MTsz 2:2), cannot be explained in any other way except as a form of contamination with *ocsmány* (1560) ‘hideous’. In light of the very late appearance of both *becsmérel*, *becsmél* and *becsméll* in Hungarian written sources, it may reasonably be doubted that *-m-* in *becsméll* &c. is the same inchoative *-m-* as in *eszmél* (after 1372 / around 1448) ‘1. to reckon; 2. to regain consciousness’ (see TESz 1: 802; EWUng 337).²⁹

28 As far as Hung. *ócsár* is concerned, it is attested (only) in Sermdom, we should, however, take into consideration the fact that a simple phonetic process might also have taken place in it, i.e. e.g. **ocsárlván* > *ócsárván*, cf. the form <olcharlyā> recorded in the same source.

29 To be quite frank, the other example of the *-mél* suffix mentioned in TESz and EWUng., namely Hung. dial. *kegyémél* ‘to pamper, to take care very carefully’ is far from convincing: *kegyémél* is extremely rare and is known from the dialect of the Moldavian Csangos (Hung. *Csángó*; see MTsz 1: 1085). We do not know of any historical data that would allow us to say that the word is not a novel form: the word is absent from NySz, OklSz, RMG, SzT, and is only mentioned as a parallel example for *eszmél* and *becsmél* in TESz and EWUng. Additionally, the origin of Hung. *kegy* ‘grace; favour’ is still unknown.

4. If the above is true, i.e. if *ócsárol* is of Slavonic origin and *becsmérel* evolved under its influence, then, historically speaking, the number of Hungarian words containing the alleged *-árol* ~ *-érel* derivative suffix would dwindle to one, i.e. to *fecsérel* (of unclear origin), or perhaps, but less probably, two (what the base and origin of Hung. *sikárol* is remains a matter of debate).

Symbols

- ~ = alternation
- >, < = phonetic or semantic development
- , ← = derivation

Abbreviations

a. = after; arch. = archaic; c = circa [used in TLH]; Eng. = English; EOT = East Old Turkic; ESlav. = East Slavonic; Hung. = Hungarian; MHung. = Middle Hungarian; OCS = Old Church Slavonic; OHung. = Old Hungarian; OPol. = Old Polish; ORuss. = Old Russian; p = post [used in TLH]; prep. = preposition; PSlav. = Proto-Slavonic; PT = Proto-Turkic; pers. = person; Russ. = Russian; sg. = singular; Slav. = Slavonic; SSlav. = South Slavonic; suff = suffix [used in TLH]; Tk. = (General) Turkic; unorg = unorganic [used in TLH]; Ural. = Uralic; WOT = West Old Turkic

References

- Agyagási K., Csúcs S. 2012. Rev. of Berta, Róna-Tas 2011. [in Hungarian; Turcological content reviewed by Agyagási on pp. 443–461, Finno-Ugric content reviewed by Csúcs on pp. 462–468]. – *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 108: 443–470.
- Balassa J. 1894. A magyar magánhangzók története. – *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 24: 257–286.
- Balázs J. 1977. Új etimológiai szótárunk a mérlegen. – *Magyar Nyelv* 73: 265–279.
- Benkő L. 1957. *Magyar nyelvjárástörténet*. Budapest.
- Benkő L. 1984. *A magyar fiktív (passzív) tövű igék*. Budapest.
- Berta Á. 2001. Bashkir and Hungarian – and the *darázs* ‘wasp’. – Károly L., Kincses Nagy É. (eds.). *Néptörténet – Nyelvtörténet. A 70 éves Róna-Tas András köszöntése*. Szeged: 35–44.
- Berta Á., Róna-Tas A. [with the assistance of L. Károly]. 2011. *West Old Turkic. Turkic Loanwords in Hungarian*. [= *Turcologica* 84; vols. 1–2]. Wiesbaden.
- Bichlmeier H. 2013. Rev. of Berta, Róna-Tas 2011. [in German]. – *Südosteuropa-Mitteilungen* 53: 119–121.
- Borsa G. 1956. Frankovith Gergely. – *Az Országos Orvostörténeti Könyvtár Közleményei* 3: 133–140.
- Budenz J. 1871. Jelentés Vámbéry Ármin magyar–török szóegyeztéseiről. – *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 10: 67–135.

- Chelimskij E.A. 1988. Vengerskij jazyk kak istočnik dlja praslavjanskoj rekonstrukcii i rekonstrukcii slavjanskogo jazyka Pannonii. – Tolstoj N.I. (ed.). *Slavjanskoe jazykoznanie. 10 Meždunarodnyj s'ezd slavistov. Sofija, sentjabr 1988 g. Doklady sovetskoj delegacii.* Moskva: 347–368.
- Csúcs 2012 = Agyagási, Csúcs 2012.
- CzF = Czuczor G., Fogarasi J. 1862–1874. *A magyar nyelv szótára.* [vols. 1–6]. Pest.
- Dybo A.V. 2010. Vokalizm rannetjurkskich zaimstvovanij v vengerskom. – *Finnisch-Ugrische Mitteilungen* 32–33: 83–132.
- ĖSSJa = Trubačev O.N., Žuravlev A.F. (eds.). 1974–2010. *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskich jazykov. Praslavjanskij leksičeskij fond.* [vols. 1–36: *A–Otəgrəbati*]. Moskva.
- ĖSTJa = Severtjan Ė.V. 1974. *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' tjurkskich jazykov. Obščetjurkskie i mežtjurkskie osnovy na glasnye.* Moskva.
- ESz = Zaicz G. (ed.). 2006. *Etimológiai szótár. Magyar szavak és toldalékok eredete.* Budapest.
- EWUng = Benkő L. et al. (eds.). 1993–1995. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Ungarischen.* [vols. 1–2]. Budapest.
- Fabó K. 1989. A gyakorító és mozzanatos igék morfológiája és szemantikája. – *Általános Nyelvészeti Tanulmányok* 17: 31–48.
- Fehértői K. 1983. *Árpád-kori kis személynévtár.* Budapest.
- Fokos D. 1932. Néhány melléknevünk eredetéhez. – *Magyar Nyelvőr* 61: 110–116.
- Gerstner K. 2014. Az Új magyar etimológiai szótár munkálatairól. – *Magyar Tudomány* 175.9: 1029–1037.
- Gombocz Z. 1907. Régi török jövevényszavaink. – *Magyar Nyelv* 3: 17–29, 62–72, 105–116, 153–165, 213–224, 250–263, 307–318, 357–370, 395–406.
- Gombocz Z. 1908. *Honfoglaláselőtti török jövevényszavaink.* Budapest.
- Hitch D. 2015. Rev. of Berta, Róna-Tas 2011. [in English]. – *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 135.3: 633–637.
- Hoffmann I. (ed.). 2005. *Korai magyar helynévszótár, 1000–1350. 1. Abaúj–Csongrád vármegye.* Debrecen.
- Honti L. [forthcoming]. *Etymologica hungaro–turcica avagy uráli hangtörténeti jegyzetek.* [A final draft made accessible by the author in a private letter, 157 pp.].
- Horger A. 1911. *Egy ismeretlen magyar hangtörvény.* [= *Nyelvészeti Füzetek* 65]. Budapest.
- Horger A. 1924. *Magyar szavak története.* Budapest.
- Jankowski H. 2013. Rev. of Berta, Róna-Tas 2011. [in English]. – *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 66.1: 151–169.
- Keszler B. (ed.). 2000. *Magyar grammatika.* Budapest.
- Knieszsa I. 1952. *Helyesírásunk története a könyvnyomtatás koráig.* Budapest.
- Knieszsa I. 1955. *A magyar nyelv szláv jövevényszavai.* [vols. 1/1–2]. Budapest.
- Kúnos I. 1882. A mássalhangzók disszimilációja a magyarban. – *Magyar Nyelvőr* 11: 486–494.
- Ligeti L. 1976. Régi török jövevényszavaink etimológiai problémái. – Benkő L., Sal E.K. (eds.). *Az etimológia elmélete és módszere. Az 1974. augusztus 22. és 24. között rendezett nemzetközi konferencia előadásai.* [= *Nyelvtudományi Értekezések* 89]. Budapest: 193–199.

- Ligeti L. 1986. *A magyar nyelv török kapcsolatai a honfoglalás előtt és az Árpád-korban*. Budapest.
- Mészöly G. 1910. Jegyzetek a „Sermones Dominicales” Szótárához. *Magyar Nyelv* 6: 401–406.
- MNyT. = Kiss J., Pusztai F. 2003. *Magyar nyelvtörténet*. Budapest.
- MSzFE = Rédei K. 1967–1978. *A Magyar szókészlet finnugor elemei: Etimológiai szótár*. [vols. 1–3]. Budapest.
- MTsz = Szinnyei J. (ed.). 1893–1901. *Magyar tájszótár*. [vols. 1–2]. Budapest.
- Munkácsi B. 1928. 1. Olcsó és ócsárol. 2. Bóda. – *Magyar Nyelvőr* 57: 87–88.
- Németh M. 2011. The Hungarian and Slavonic Background of Bashkir *týraž* ‘wasp’. – *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia* 16: 93–101.
- Németh M. 2014. The Turkic and Eastern-European linguistic background of the etymology of Hung. *tábor* ‘(military) camp’. – *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 67.1: 43–74.
- Németh M. 2015. A Slavonic etymology of Hung. *ocsúdik* ‘to come to, to awake’ and the question of the morphological adaptation of Slavonic loan verbs in Hungarian. – *Slavica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 60.1: 33–41.
- Nyirkos I. 1959. Olcsó. – *Magyar Nyelvőr* 83: 488–489.
- Nyirkos I. 1987. *Az inetimologikus mássalhangzók a magyarban*. Debrecen.
- NySz = Szarvas G., Simonyi Z. (eds.). 1890–1893. *Magyar nyelvtörténeti szótár a legrégibb nyelvelmélektől a nyelvújításig*. [vols. 1–3]. Budapest.
- OkSz = Szamota I., Zolnai G. (eds.). 1902–1906. *Magyar oklevél-szótár. Régi oklevelekben és egyéb iratokban előforduló magyar szók gyűjteménye. Pótlék a Magyar nyelvtörténeti szótárhoz. Lexicon vocabulorum Hungaricorum. In diplomatis aliisque scriptis quae reperiri possunt vetusto*. Budapest.
- Ölmez M. 2012. Rev. of Berta, Róna-Tas 2011. [in Turkish]. – *Türk Dili* 102.722: 175–185.
- Richards O.R. 2003. *The Pannonian Slavic Dialect of the Common Slavic Proto-Language: The view from Old Hungarian*. [= *UCLA Indo-European Studies* 2]. Los Angeles.
- RMG = Berrár J., Károly S. 1984. *Régi magyar glosszárium*. Budapest.
- Robbeets M. 2012. Rev. of Berta, Róna-Tas 2011. [in English]. – *Turkic Languages* 16: 265–293.
- Róna-Tas A. 1998. Western Old Turkic. – Johanson L. et al. (eds.). *The Mainz Meeting. Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, August 3–6, 1944*. Wiesbaden: 619–626.
- Róna-Tas A. 2010. Morphological embedding of Turkic verbal bases in Hungarian. – Johanson L., Robbeets M. (eds.). *Transeurasian verbal morphology in a comparative perspective: genealogy, contact, chance*. [= *Turcologica* 78]. Wiesbaden: 33–42.
- Simonyi Z. 1880. A magyar gyakorító és mozzanatos igék képzése. – *Nyelvtudományi Értekezések* 16: 237–269.
- Simonyi Z. 1890. Kurejt. – *Magyar Nyelvőr* 19: 278–280.
- Simonyi Z. 1909. Elvonás. – *Magyar Nyelvőr* 38: 469–471.
- SlPsł = Ślawski F. (ed.). 1974–2001. *Słownik prasłowiański*. [vols. 1–8: A–Gyža]. Wrocław.
- SRJXI–XVII = Barchudarov S.G., Filin F.P., Šmelev D.N., Bogatova G.A., Kryško V.B. (eds.). 1975–2008. *Slovar' russkogo jazyka XI–XVII vv*. [vols. 1–28: A–Sulebnyj]. Moskva.

- SsIS = Cejtin R.M., Večerka R., Blagova È. [Bláhová E.] (eds.). 1994. *Staroslavjanskij slovar' (po rukopisjam X–XI vekov)*. Moskva.
- SStp = Urbańczyk S. (ed.). 1953–2002. *Słownik staropolski*. [vols. 1–11]. Warszawa.
- Stachowski M. 2014. Remarks on the investigation of the oldest layer of Turkic loan-words in Hungarian. – *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia* 19: 215–222.
- Szabó K. (ed.). 1879. *Régi Magyar Könyvtár. Az 1531–1711. megjelent magyar nyomtatványok könyvészeti kézikönyve*. [vol. 1]. Budapest.
- Szily K. 1902. Az *-ár, -ér* névszó-képzőkről. – *Magyar Nyelvőr* 31: 177–180.
- SzőfSz = Bárczi G. 1941. *Magyar szófejtő szótár*. Budapest.
- SzT = Szabó T.A. [vols. 1–7], Vámszer M. [vols. 8–11], Kósa F. [vol. 12], Fazekas E. [vols. 13–14] (eds.). 1975–2014. *Erdélyi magyar szótörténeti tár. Dicționar istoric al lexicului maghiar din Transilvania. Historisches Wörterbuch des siebenbürgisch-ungarischen Wortschatzes*. București [vols. 1–4]; Budapest [vols. 5–8]; Cluj-Napoca [vols. 9–14].
- TESz = Benkő L. et al. (eds.). 1967–1976. *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára*. [vols. 1–3]. Budapest.
- TLH = Berta, Róna-Tas 2011.
- TNyt = Benkő L. (ed.). 1991–1995. *A magyar nyelv történeti nyelvtana*. [vol. 1: *A korai ómagyar kor és előzményei*, vol. 2/1: *A kései ómagyar kor. Morfematika*, vol. 2/2: *A kései ómagyar kor. Mondattan. Szövegrammatika*]. Budapest.
- Tóth V. 2004. Inetimologikus mássalhangzók a régi magyar helynevekben. – *Magyar Nyelv* 100.3: 321–331; *Magyar Nyelv* 100.4: 454–470.
- Uçar E. 2011. Rev. of Berta, Róna-Tas 2011. [in Turkish]. – *Zeitschrift für die Welt der Türken* 3.3: 315–319.
- ÚESz = *Új magyar etimológiai szótár*. [vol. 1: A–K, vol. 2: L–Zs; nszt.nytud.hu/etimologia.html; last update: 2016, April 26].
- ÚMTSz = B. Lőrinczy É. (ed.). 1979–2010. *Új magyar tájszótár*. [vols. 1–5]. Budapest.
- Vámbéry Á. 1870. Magyar és török-tatár szóegyezések. – *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 8: 109–189.
- Zoltán A. 1999. „Lappangó” szláv eredetű szavaink: szid, szégyen. – *Magyar Nyelv* 95.1: 54–59.
- Zoltán A. 2005a. A magyar–szláv érintkezések kezdetei és fázisai. – Zoltán A. *Szavak, szólások, szövegek. Nyelvészeti és filológiai tanulmányok*. [Reprint]. Budapest: 11–27.
- Zoltán A. 2005b. Szláv–magyar etimológiák. – *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 102: 238–246.
- Zoltán A. 2005c. Węg. *öböl* ‘wypukłość; zatoka’ i *öblit* ‘płukać’. – Siemieniec-Golaś E., Pomorska M. (eds.). *Turks and non-Turks. Studies on the history of linguistic and cultural contacts. Special issue presented to Professor Stanisław Stachowski on his seventy fifth birthday*. [= *Studia Turcologica Cracoviensia* 10]. Kraków: 541–544.
- Zoltán A. 2006. Slavisch-ungarische Etymologien (*tör* ‘brechen, zerschlagen’, *töröl* ‘wischen’). – Symanzik B. (ed.). *Studia Philologica Slavica. Festschrift für Gerhard Birkfellner zum 65. Geburtstag, gewidmet von Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern*. [vol. 2]. Berlin: 889–895.

- Zoltán A. 2010. K etimológii vengerskogo nazvanija darázs 'osa, šeršeň'. – *Studia Slavica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 55.2: 471–473.
- Zoltán A. 2011. Szláv–magyar etimológiák (a tervezett új magyar etimológiai szótárban hasznosítható tanulságok). – Nagy L.K., Németh M., Tátrai S. (eds.). *Languages and Cultures in Research and Education. Jubilee Volume Presented to Professor Ralf-Peter Ritter on His Seventieth Birthday*. Kraków: 261–266.
- Zoltán A. 2012a. Kiss Lajos, a szlavista. – *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 108: 418–426.
- Zoltán A. 2012b. Slavjano-vengerskie etimológii (veng. *seb* 'rana' i ustar., obl. *seb* 'bystrota'). – *Annales Instituti Slavici Universitatis Debreceniensis* 41: 57–61.
- Zoltán A. 2013. Slavjanskíe dialektý Karpatskogo bassejna vo vremja prichoda vengrov (IX v.). – *Studia Slavica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 58.1: 209–218.
- Zoltán A. 2014. A magyar–szláv nyelvi kapcsolatok. – Sudár B., Szentpéteri J., Petkes Z., Lezsák G., Zsidai Z. (eds.). *Magyar őstörténet. Tudomány és hagyományörzés*. [= MTA BTK MÓT Kiadványok 1]. Budapest: 205–210.
- Zoltán A. 2015. Darázs és vizsga. – Bárh M.J., Bodó C., Kocsis Z. (eds.). *A nyelv dimenziói. Tanulmányok Juhász Dezső tiszteletére*. Budapest: 161–167.

Old and Middle Hungarian sources and their editions

- Bod P. 1767. *Dictionarium Hungarico-Latinum, Olim magnâ curâ à clarissimo viro Alberto Molnar Szentziensi collectum; Tandem Revifum, & aliquot vocabulorum, in Molnariano defideratorum, millibus Latinè redditis locupletatum, Studiô & vigilis Francisci Páriz Pápai Medicinæ Doctoris, & in Alma Enyedina Pubici Profefforis. Nunc verò Tam ex ejusdem Philoponi F.P. Pápai fecundis curis ac Notationibus Mss. quàm Propriis & aliorum Observationibus, expletis quæ defuerunt, amputatis quæ superfuerunt, & vocibus quibusvis in fuum ordinem redactis, volentium ufibus editum; Operâ Petri Bod, de F. Tsernáton, V.D. Miniftri M. Igeniensis. Novæ huic Editioni nunc primùm folertiâ Tzpographi addita est Lingua Germanica. Cibinii (= Sibiu).*
- Döbrentei G., Jászay P. (eds.). 1842. *Régi magyar nyelvemlékek. Harmad kötet. A' négy evangyéliomiró 1437–1441 közötti fordításának Tatrosi másolata, 1466^{ból}, „Németi Györgynek Hensel Imre fiának keze miatt” vagy Müncheni Codex. Buda.*
- Frankovith G. 1588. *Hasznos Es Fölötte szikseges könyv, az Isten fiainak es vtet felő hiueknek lelki vigasztalasokra es testi épöletőkre szerzetetöt Frankovith Gergely D. által. Mellyben sok rendbéli betegsegők ellen valo orvossagokis be vannak irua, mellyeket Isten az ő nagy io voltából es aiandekából, Embörőknek egesegekre rendölt. Ecclesiast. 38. Tiszteld az oruost az sziksegert. Monyorokerek (= Monyorókerék). [See Szabó 1879: 113].*
- Heltai G. 1566. *Szaz Fabula, Mellyeket Ezopvsból, es egyebvñnen egybe gyűtet, és össze szörzet, a fabulaknac értelmével egyetembe. Colosvarot (= Kolozsvár). [See Szabó 1879: 31; available at: mek.oszk.hu/06400/06417/html].*
- Katona L. 1908. *Székeljudvarhelyi codex. [= Nyelvemléktár 15]. Budapest.*

- Medgyesi P. 1650. *Dialogvs Politico-Ecclesiasticus*. Az Az: Két Kereftyén Embereknek Egygymáffal-való befzelgetések: kiknek egyyike, ugymint az KERDEZKEDő, némelly dolgokban, meg nem fintén elég tanult és erőfs, de nem általkodott, hanem őrómeft tanuló; a' máfik a' FELELő tanultabb és vaftagabb. Befzelgetések vagyon Az EGGYHÁZI JGAZGATO PRESBYTEREKRőL, avagy Vénekről, Oeregekről; és az PRESBYTERIUM-RUL Eggyházi Tanátsrol. Bártfa. [See Szabó 1879: 354; facsimile: real-r.mtak.hu/367/1/RMK_I_o831-RM_I_4r_0076.pdf].
- MünchK = (1) Döbrentei, Jászay 1842; (2) Nyíri 1971; (3) Szabó 1985.
- N. Abaffy C. (ed.). 1993. *Székeljudvarhelyi Kódex 1526–1528. A nyelvemlék hasonmása és betűhű átírata*. [= *Régi Magyar Kódexek* 15]. Budapest.
- Nyíri A. (ed.). 1971. *A Müncheni Kódex 1466-ból. Kritikai szövegkiadás a latin megfelelővel együtt*. Budapest.
- Pápai Páriz F. 1708. *Dictionarium Latino-Hungaricum, Succum & medullam purioris Latinitatis, ejusque genuinam in Lingvam Hungaricam conuersionem, ad mentem & sensum proprium Scriptorum Clafficorum, exhibens: Indefffo XV. Annorum labore, subcifivis ab ordinariis negotiis, temporibus collectum, & in hoc Corpus coactum à Francisco Pariz Pápai [...]. Leutschoviae (= Lőcse)*.
- SermDom = Szilády 1910.
- Szabó S. (ed.). 1908. *Régi magyar codexek. Székeljudvarhelyi codex*. [= *Nyelvemléktár. Régi Magyar Codexek és Nyomtatványok* 15]. Budapest.
- Szabó T.Á. (ed.). 1985. *Müncheni Kódex [1466]. A négy evangélium szövege és szótára*. Békéscsaba.
- Szalay Á. (ed.). 1861. *Magyar leveles tár. Első kötet: Négyszáz magyar levél a XVI. századból. 1504–1560*. Pest. [Available at: reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10011506_00288.html].
- Szenczi Molnár A. 1604. *Dictionarium Latinovngaricvm. [...] Item vice versa Dictionarivm Vngaricolatinvm*. Noribergae (= Nürnberg). [Facsimile: reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10589184_00005.html].
- Szenczi Molnár A. 1611. *Lexicon Latino-græco-hungaricum [...]. Hanoviae (= Hanau)*. [A 2nd, enlarged edition of Szenczi 1604].
- SzékK = (1) Katona 1908; (2) Szabó 1908; (3) N. Abaffy 1993.
- Szilády Á. 1910. *Sermones Dominicales. Két XV. századból való magyar glosszás latin codex* [vols. 1–2; non vidi]. Budapest.
- Zolnai G. 1910. A Budapesti és Németújvári glosszák. – *Magyar Nyelvőr* 39: 460–474 [part 1].
- Zolnai G. 1911. A Budapesti és Németújvári glosszák. – *Magyar Nyelvőr* 40: 181–182 [part 2].
- Zrínyi M. 1650–1651. *Adriai tengernek Sirenaya*. – [The Zagreb manuscript, stored in the National and University Library in Zagreb; first printed in Vienna in 1651; see Szabó 1879: 358; facsimile: mek.oszk.hu/02600/02676/pdf].

